**HOW TO DO THIS WONDERFUL PEOPLE**

Your job is to **examine** perspectives about either the cause or consequences of the Treaty of Waitangi. So then you can **analyse** them.



To analyse means you have to:

**-read what the historians have to say about the reasons why the Treaty was signed.**

-**read what “contemporaries” have to say about the need for a Treaty. Contemporaries are those that were involved at the time. 1830’s to 1840.**

- **compare the perspectives. Are they the same in any way to another person’s perspective?**

**-look for contrasts between the perspectives. Are they very different in their opinion than another one you read?**

**-comment if you have noticed that a secondary source - or a number of secondary sources - have used the same primary source. This is evidence of corroboration within the perspectives.**

**-comment if you notice that opinions about the reasons for the Treaty have changed over time. Think about Hone Heke. How did his opinions about the Treaty change within a few years? Find others who changed their mind about what the British signed the Treaty for after a couple of years. Look at how commentators and historians writing about the Treaty sounded in 1898 and 1914. They are talking about the Treaty as if it was inevitable that British would take over Maori. How does this compare to Claudia Orange’s explanations about the steps to the Treaty being signed?**

At each point that you make a statement, you must explain what you mean, and then go on to provide examples from the text.

eg. \_\_\_\_\_author/name of contemporary\_\_\_\_\_ expresses the opinion that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. I consider that this means \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. For example \_\_\_\_\_\_ writes in \_\_name of text \_\_\_ “\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_”. This perspective is repeated/disputed/is similar to/ in contrast to in the opinion of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ when they write \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Another argument is …………..etc.

Similarly ……………..

Alternatively …………………

According to ………………...

**-decide which is the most convincing perspective from your point of view as an Historian because you will refer to the evidence to support your opinion.**

Use words like:

- **on balance.**

Or

**-after analysis of the perspectives of what was needed for New Zealand at the time it appears that/ one could consider that/ one could conclude that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.**

**So, what have these commentators and historians been saying about the Treaty over the years?**

|  |
| --- |
| **The Waitangi Tribunal Official Site** [**http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2**](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2)  **There have always been different perspectives about what was agreed at Waitangi in February 1840. From almost the moment of te Tiriti’s signing, the event, too, has been retold differently by Māori and Pākehā – at first by those who witnessed it and soon enough by countless others.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **In 1846, the former Governor, Robert FitzRoy, noted the markedly varying ways in which the treaty had been interpreted.**  **Some persons still affect to deride it; some say it was a deception; and some would unhesitatingly set it aside; while others esteem it highly as a well considered and judicious work, of the utmost importance to both the coloured and the white man in New Zealand. That the natives did not view all its provisions in exactly the same light as our authorities is undoubted …**[**1**](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.1)  Ian Ward, The Shadow of the Land: A Study of British Policy and Racial Conflict in New Zealand 1832–1852 (Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs, Historical Publications Branch, 1968), p 42 |

|  |
| --- |
| **The Waitangi Tribunal Official Site** [**http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2**](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2)  The Māori perspective – to the extent that we can speak in such general terms – has laid heavy emphasis on the Māori text and stressed the retention [keeping] of rangatiratanga. At times, Māori protest at perceived injustices has appeared to accept that there was a full cession of sovereignty, but we suspect this will often have stemmed from the power imbalances of the day and the need for Māori to appeal to the Crown for redress [fixing up]. **In fact, a general denial that the Crown gained sovereignty or supreme authority on the basis of the treaty appears to have characterised a number of Māori perspectives during the nineteenth century, especially when Māori retained substantive control**, **and over the past three or more decades, during which Māori protest over the denial of rights guaranteed by the treaty has become more assertive.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **The Waitangi Tribunal Official Site** [**http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2**](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2)  For their part, Pākehā and the Crown have until relatively recently generally seen the treaty in terms of the English text alone – **as a cession of supreme authority in article 1, the guarantee of Māori rights to their property in article 2, and as a statement of some kind of ‘equality’ in article 3 (expressed by some as a requirement for Māori conformity to Pākehā norms).**  It must be considered, too, that the Crown gave little attention to the treaty for long periods – exemplified by the treaty sheets themselves being kept in such miserable storage facilities for several decades in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.  For all that, the very fact of **the treaty has often been regarded by Pākehā commentators (at least until recently) as a particularly enlightened and well-meaning act on the part of the British Crown – one from which Māori have benefited, and one which sets New Zealand apart from other settler colonies, particularly those in Australia.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **The Waitangi Tribunal Official Site** [**http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2**](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2)  It is relevant for us to concentrate on this most recent period of thinking and writing about the treaty, as the greater distance from the events of 1840 has allowed for a more rounded assessment of them and the motivations of the participants, based on more careful attention to the full range of evidence. |

|  |
| --- |
| Reflecting on the greater engagement [the whole body of thinking and writing about the Treaty] of historians with the treaty, in 1989 Dr John Owens concluded that there were essentially ‘only two significant phases’ in the scholarship: ‘before about 1970 and after’. As he put it:  There are of course differences of opinion over aspects and different writers have different emphases. One can occasionally group writers together into a kind of school of thought. **But the basic fact is that before the 1970s our histories were written by Pakeha for Pakeha,** **after the 1970s there was a Maori presence in historical writing.** It tells us something of the history of our race relations that **the same kind of interpretation, the same terminology, appears in the 19th century and carries through to the 1960s.**[3](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.3)  J M R Owens, ‘Historians and the Treaty of Waitangi’, Archifacts (April 1990), p 6 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Exception to this:**  In 1947, Professor James Rutherford … wrote that the British understanding that, through article 1, Māori would become subject to the authority of the Governor was not conveyed by those explaining the treaty; that the ‘restraints and restrictions and responsibilities’ of being British citizens received no emphasis alongside the ‘rights and privileges’ mentioned in article 3; and that kāwanatanga would have seemed a weak authority to the chiefs, especially compared to rangatiratanga, which would have left them thinking they retained ‘all their power authority and “mana” as rangatira over their own people’.[4](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.4) Rutherford’s insights, however, were atypical. [unusual]  James Rutherford, ‘Hone Heke’s Rebellion 1844–1846: An Episode in the Establishment of British Rule in New Zealand’, Auckland University College Bulletin, no 34 (1947), p 8 |

|  |
| --- |
| The general pre-1970s consensus [agreement] that Professor Owens referred to was essentially founded on the work of William Pember Reeves, who wrote in 1898 that the chiefs ‘were fully aware that under it [the treaty] the supreme authority passed to the Queen’,[5](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.5)  William Pember Reeves, The Long White Cloud: Ao Tea Roa (1898; repr Auckland: Golden Press, 1973), p 145 |

|  |
| --- |
| T Lindsay Buick, claimed in 1914 that:  The natives … understood clearly enough that for the advantages they hoped to reap from the treaty they were yielding much of their existing power to the *Pakeha* Governor, and whether it was much or little they were the more willing to surrender it because they realised that the advent of the European had so altered their social conditions that rule by the old method was no longer possible.  …  The sovereignty was the shadow, and the land was the substance; and since the shadow was already passing from them by force of circumstances over which they were powerless to exercise control, they consented to its surrender with all the less regret. … The Treaty of Waitangi therefore became what it professed to be, a yielding of the supreme political power in the country to the British Crown, and when the last signature had been put to it, Britain’s right to colonise and govern in New Zealand was incontestable before all the world.[6](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.6)  Thomas Lindsay Buick, The Treaty of Waitangi: How New Zealand Became a British Colony (Wellington S and W MacKay, 1914), pp 227–228 |

|  |
| --- |
| **The Waitangi Tribunal Official Site** [**http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2**](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#H1040.8.2)  The Māori refusal to continue quietly to accept this one-sided interpretation helped force changes in the scholarship [academic thinking and writing], as did the international trend towards decolonisation [opposite to colonisation].  But so, too, did one particular article in the New Zealand Journal of History in 1972, by Ruth Ross.  Ruth M Ross, ‘Te Tiriti o Waitangi: Texts and Translations’, NZJH, vol 6, no 2 (1972)  This article, entitled ‘Te Tiriti o Waitangi: Texts and Translations’, stands as probably the single most important interpretive advance on the subject in modern times. **Ross argued that, far from the solemn and far-reaching blueprint for the nation’s development it was often portrayed to have been, the treaty transaction was characterised by confusion and undue haste.** She made the important observation that sovereignty was translated by Henry Williams in a different way from his translation of ‘all sovereign power and authority’ in the declaration [Of Independence of the Northern Tribes] only a few years previously.  **She concluded that the Māori text was the true treaty and that what mattered was how it had been understood here, not what the Colonial Office had made of the English text(s) in London.** Her rigorous … examination of the original documents **exposed the unquestioning acceptance of myths about the treaty by an earlier generation of scholars. And she left her contemporaries with the uncomfortable realisation that a reliance on what was said in the English text alone was no longer intellectually honest.**  As well as **her influence on a range of other scholars in the decades to come, Ross’s article had perhaps an even more important impact. It was a catalyst for the inclusion of the Māori text in the schedule to the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975, as well as the authority given to the Tribunal in section 5(2) of the Act to ‘determine the meaning and effect of the Treaty as embodied in the 2 texts and to decide issues raised by the differences between them’**. Indeed, **the third Labour Government’s Caucus Committee on Māori Affairs referred to Ross’s article in its reports of 1973 and 1974 on implementing the Labour Party’s manifesto promise to legally recognise ‘the principles set out in the Treaty of Waitangi’**. These reports were considered by Cabinet and were **the basis for its decision to introduce the Bill that became the 1975 Act**.  Matthew Palmer, The Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand’s Law and Constitution (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2008), pp 134, 184–187  **Dr (later Professor) Michael Belgrave thought that, aside from influencing other scholars and members of Parliament, Ross also ‘provided the historical ammunition’ for the new generation of Māori Tiriti activists**.Michael Belgrave, Historical Frictions: Maori Claims and Reinvented Histories (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2005), p 51 |

|  |
| --- |
| **The Waitangi Tribunal site**  **An historian who was particularly influenced by Ruth Ross is Dame Claudia Orange,** who once described Ross as having ‘handed the baton over to me’.[10](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.10)  Lauren Bartlett, ‘The Expert’s Expert: The Treaty Makes us Unique as a Country’, New Zealand Herald, 8 January 2007  Orange’s book, *The Treaty of Waitangi*, was first published in 1987 and has now sold over 40,000 copies[11](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.11)  ‘The Treaty of Waitangi’, Bridget Williams Books, http://www.bwb.co.nz/books/the-treaty-of-waitangi, accessed 12 June 2014  With a gentler tone than Ross’s challenging work, Orange articulated many of the same messages as her mentor, although **she stressed less the confusion that surrounded the treaty than the ‘spirit’ that underlay it. Her text has become the essential reference point for most historical works about the treaty since. Indeed, nearly three decades after its publication, *The Treaty of Waitangi* retains its reputation as the authoritative work on the subject.**  Writing **in 1989, Professor Owens thought it came ‘near to the ideal’** in the way it was  **“*concerned with what actually happened in 1840, concerned with the continuing dialogue, concerned to balance Maori with Pakeha. Not many who have written about the Treaty have achieved this balance.***[12](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.12)”  Owens, ‘Historians and the Treaty of Waitangi’, p 6  The same year, **Professor Keith Sorrenson remarked that Orange had *“done more than any other historian to recover that submerged Māori history of the Treaty which has hitherto existed largely in oral tradition’*.**[**13**](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.13)  M P K Sorrenson, ‘Towards a Radical Reinterpretation of New Zealand History: The Role of the Waitangi Tribunal’, in Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi, ed Ian H Kawharu (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1989), p 159 |

|  |
| --- |
| Waitangi Tribunal site:  Several voices have, however, pushed back against the new orthodoxy of an underlying treaty ‘spirit’ or relationship described by Orange …  Professor William H Oliver in 2001, in his essay entitled ‘The Future Behind Us: The Waitangi Tribunal’s Retrospective Utopia’ … criticised the Tribunal for the application of contemporary or ‘presentist’ concerns to the analysis of distant events.[15](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.15)    William H Oliver, ‘The Future Behind Us: The Waitangi Tribunal’s Retrospective Utopia’, in Histories, Power and Loss: Uses of the Past – a New Zealand Commentary, ed Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001), pp 9–29  Another example of this is Dr (later Professor) Giselle Byrnes’ book The Waitangi Tribunal and New Zealand History (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2004).  Professor Andrew Sharp and Dr (later Professor) Paul McHugh summarised this argument as follows: **‘The more powerfully the passion to change or preserve the world informs particular histories, the more they bear testimony to their authors’ present concerns.’**[**16**](http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-8-past-perspectives-on-te-tiriti-and-the-treaty#E1040.8.16)  Andrew Sharp and P G McHugh, ‘Introduction’, in Histories, Power and Loss, p 2  Waitangi Tribunal site cont:  Notable **examples of ‘anti-presentism’** applied to the signing of te Tiriti include a brief contextual section in Professor Alan Ward’s 1999 book *An Unsettled History: Treaty Claims in New Zealand Today*; Lyndsay Head’s chapter ‘The Pursuit of Modernity in Maori Society’ published in the same 2001 volume as Oliver’s critique; and Belgrave’s 2005 book *Historical Frictions: Maori Claims and Reinvented Histories*.  **These scholars have not so much returned to the arguments in vogue before the Māori text was considered, but rather employed the Māori text in their argument for sovereignty having been ceded.**  **In sum, therefore, the scholarship [thinking and writing] about the meaning and effect of the treaty shifted markedly from the early 1970s, when historians took more account of the fact that the treaty existed in two languages and was made by peoples with entirely different cultural assumptions. Ross led this major shift, and Orange’s book – which carried on much of the same reasoning – has now been the leading reference text on the treaty for almost 30 years. More recently, however, several scholars have objected to what they see as the application of contemporary judgements to nineteenth-century actions.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **The Waitangi Tribunals Chapter 7 tells us all about what happened during the negotiations.**  http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/Reports/he-whakaputanga-me-te-tiriti-the-declaration-and-the-treaty-the-report-on-stage-1-of-the-te-paparahi-o-te-raki-inquiry/chapter-7-the-negotiation-and-signing-of-te-tiriti |

|  |
| --- |
| Mrs V :So, you can see that there is a good chance that interpretations/perspectives/opinions about what led to the Treaty being signed or reasons for the Treaty being signed also have changed over the years. This is because our history about the Treaty of Waitangi has been written by Pakeha for Pakeha up ‘till around 1970. Then after 1970 Maori activism and the post-colonial ideas of history writers started to show a different perspective. But then some today are saying that Pakeha are just putting modern ideas about fairness and not being a dominating culture onto our views of the choices that Maori appeared to be making for themselves when they signed the Treaty. What do you think? |